

RECEIVED

APR 12 2012

MELINDA HAAG (CASBN 132612)
United States Attorney

MIRANDA KANE (CABN 150630)
Chief, Criminal Division

MICHAEL H. LAMPHIER (AZBN 21535)
Special Assistant United States Attorney

Defense Language Institute – Criminal Law
1336 Plummer Street, Building 275
Monterey, CA 93944
Telephone: (831) 242-6394
Email: michael.lamphier@us.army.mil

Attorneys for Plaintiff

FILED

APR 16 2012

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SALINAS DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	Criminal No.: CR-11-00511 PSG
Plaintiff,)	SECOND STIPULATION AND
vs.)	[PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
ROBERT DONALD FLORES,)	
Defendant.)	

On April 2, 2012, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status hearing. The parties jointly requested that the case be continued from April 2, 2012, until June 4, 2012 at 9:30 a.m., in order to allow time for the parties to discuss the proposed terms for a plea agreement. In addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, from April 2, 2012 to 4 June, 2012 at 9:30 a.m. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.

1 SO STIPULATED:

MELINDA HAAG
United States Attorney

2
3
4 DATED: 9 April 2012

/S/
MICHAEL H. LAMPHIER
Special Assistant United States Attorney

5
6
7 DATED:

/S/
MANUEL ARAUJO
Counsel for ROBERT DONALD FLORES

8
9
10 ORDER

11 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded
12 under the Speedy Trial Act from April 2, 2012 to June 4, 2012. The Court finds, based on the
13 aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice are served by granting the requested continuance
14 and outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to
15 grant the requested continuance would deny the parties reasonable time necessary for effective
16 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage
17 of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18
18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

19 SO ORDERED.

20
21 DATED: 4/16/12


~~BETH S. GREWARE~~
United States Magistrate Judge

Howard R. Lloyd